



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/047,136	01/15/2002	Kwang Koo Jee	15220	4241
7590 01/20/2004 Scully, Scott, Murphy & Presser 400 Garden City Plaza Garden City, NY 11530			EXAMINER WYSZOMIERSKI, GEORGE P	
			ART UNIT 1742	PAPER NUMBER

DATE MAILED: 01/20/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/047,136

Applicant(s)

JEE, KWANG KOO

Examiner

George P Wyszomierski

Art Unit

1742

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 October 2003.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

### Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

Art Unit: 1742

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-3, 6-10, and 13-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hodgson et al. (U.S. Patent 4,758,285), in view of either Sato (U.S. Patent 4,983,029) or Nakamura et al. (U.S. Patent 6,077,368).

Hodgson discloses an eyeglass temple piece, made of a nickel-titanium shape memory alloy, which is deformed in its martensitic state, then physically confined within a body of solid particles. The particles in the confined portion are then compacted, and this portion is heated to the austenitic temperature of the alloy so that the alloy can recover its shape. Hodgson differs from the claimed invention in that Hodgson uses the above-mentioned particles as a confining medium as opposed to the presently claimed "pipe", and the only particular portion of a pair of eyeglasses worked upon by Hodgson is a temple piece as opposed to the "lens rim" of the instant claims. These differences are not seen as resulting in a patentable distinction between the prior art and the claimed invention because:

a) The temple piece of Hodgson can clearly be seen to comprise a long, thin piece; see Hodgson figure 3. Any confinement medium for such a piece would inevitably be pipe shaped, i.e. would surround this long, thin piece in such a manner that the confinement medium would, if looked at by itself, be in the shape of a pipe or tube. Further, Hodgson column 8, lines 32-36 indicates that mechanical restraints, such as clamps or sleeves may be used in the prior art process. Thus, no distinction is seen in this aspect of the invention.

b) The Sato and Nakamura patents indicate that it was well-known in the art, at the time of the invention, to employ nickel-titanium shape memory alloys as lens rims for eyeglasses, i.e. the same material as used by Hodgson.

Consequently, the disclosure of Hodgson et al., together with those of Sato or Nakamura et al., would have taught the presently claimed invention to a person having ordinary skill in the art.

3. Claims 4, 5, 11 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hodgson et al. in view of either Sato or Nakamura et al., as set forth supra, and further in view of Rossin (PG Pub. No. 2001/0028431).

The Hodgson process does not include the rolling or swaging steps as set forth in the instant claims. Paragraph [0022] of Rossin indicates the conventionality in the art of utilizing a rotary swaging process for the purpose of deforming nickel-titanium shape memory alloys which are to be used as eyeglass frames. Because of this conventionality, one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to incorporate such a process into the process as disclosed by Hodgson et al. (again combined with the lens rim teaching of Sato or Nakamura et al.

4. In a response filed October 24, 2003, Applicant alleges that the process of the Hodgson patent is not equivalent to that presently claimed, and/or that the secondary references (Sato, Nakamura, Rossin) do not disclose the presently claimed process. Applicant's arguments have been carefully considered, but are not persuasive of patentability because:

a) It is unclear precisely what distinction(s) could be made between the Hodgson process and that of the claimed invention, and Applicant has not pointed to any specific difference between the two, and


b) While the secondary references admittedly do not disclose the claimed process, these references disclose individual aspects of the invention as set forth in the rejections supra, in a context consistent with both Hodgson the present invention.

**5. THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to George Wyszomierski whose telephone number is (571) 272-1252. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday thru Friday from 8:00 a.m. to 4:30 p.m. Eastern time.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Roy King, can be reached on (571) 272-1244. Effective October 1, 2003, all patent application related correspondence transmitted by facsimile must be directed to the central facsimile number, (703) 872-9306. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (571) 272-1700.



GEORGE WYSZOMIERSKI  
EXAMINER

GPW  
January 9, 2004